DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 344 JC 990 477

AUTHOR	Brock, Clifford M.; Chrestman, Charles; Armstrong, Larry
TITLE	Administrative Evaluation for Faculty Retention. A Systematic Approach to Faculty Evaluation and Retention.
INSTITUTION	Itawamba Community Coll., Fulton, MS.
PUB DATE	1999-04-07
NOTE	14p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Two Year Colleges; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	*Itawamba Community College MS

ABSTRACT

To maintain a high level of trust between faculty and administration at Itawamba Community College (ICC), a system of faculty evaluation for purposes of contract renewal has been developed. At ICC, the faculty review process, a system for the improvement of teaching and learning, is defined as a different function. This report provides an overview of the faculty review and evaluation processes. The evaluation process at ICC is characterized by the following: it is short, it is data-driven and quantifiable, it is clear, it is fair, it reflects the accountability that is the hallmark of the new millennium, and it has meaning. The components used in the evaluation are driven by the job description. Points are assigned to the following components of the process: (1) teaching, which includes student ratings of instruction and advising, material preparation, recordkeeping and instructional management, advising, and student retention yield, accounts for 75 percent; (2) service to the college accounts for 10 percent; (3) service to the profession or industry accounts for 5 percent; and (4) other expectations (professional development), which includes creative and/or scholarly production (academic faculty) and compliance with standards established by external agencies (technical/vocational faculty), accounts for 10%. Attached to the report are a timetable of retention activities for the fall and spring semesters, and an administrative evaluation form. (VWC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 344

Itawamba Community College

Presents a System of

Administrative Evaluation

for

Faculty Retention

A Systematic Approach to Faculty Evaluation and Retention

Developed by

Dr. Clifford M. Brock
Dean of Academic Instruction
Dr. Charles Chrestman
Vice-President for Instruction
Larry Armstrong
Retention Committee Chairman
April 7, 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Armstrong
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

IC 990477

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Administrative Evaluation for Faculty Retention

Introduction

One of the most sensitive areas of any organization is the evaluation of the performance of its employees. In an effort to maintain a high level of trust between faculty and administration at Itawamba Community College, a system of **faculty evaluation** for purposes of contract renewal has been developed.

At ICC, the **faculty review process**, a system for the improvement of teaching and learning, is defined as a different function. Each function is described below.

Overview of the Functions

Faculty Review. This is a renewal process that allows each faculty member to look back over the past year with an eye toward the next year. The renewal comes from asking, "What have I done in the past year?" "What did I do well?" "What would make me more fulfilled and more effective next year?" Review is a process to help each faculty member analyze and improve performance. It has nothing to do with contract renewal. *(This system will be developed after the pilot phase of the Faculty Evaluation System is completed).*

Faculty Evaluation. This is an administrative function. The stated purpose of the function is to determine one of three recommendations for each faculty member:

1. The faculty member should be offered a contract for the next academic year;
2. The faculty member should be notified of deficiency(ies) and asked to develop a

plan for remediation (Personal Improvement Plan);

3. The faculty member should not be offered a contract for the next year.

Faculty *review* is an affirmation of the quality work that goes on at the college and reflects all employees' desire to work more effectively and enjoyably in the future. Faculty *evaluation* is a responsibility of the administration of the college; its purpose is to determine acceptable levels of employee performance. The evaluation process at ICC is characterized by the following:

1. It is short;
2. It is, insofar as possible, data-driven and quantifiable;
3. It is clear;
4. It is fair;
5. It reflects the accountability that is the hallmark of the new millennium;
6. It has meaning.

The administrative evaluation consists of a one-page summary sheet of several characteristics of faculty performance. Component parts and their definitions follow.

Overview and Definitions of the Components

The components used in evaluation are driven by the job description. Characteristics are collapsed into the following broad categories. Following are the components of the process (100 points possible; 80 points required):

1. ***Teaching*** ..... 75 percent
   a. Student Ratings of Instruction and Advising (50 points)
   b. Materials Preparation (5 points)
   c. Recordkeeping and Instructional Management (5 points)
   d. Advising (5 points)
   e. Student Retention Yield (10 points)
2. ***Service to the College*** *(10 points)* ..... 10 percent
3. ***Service to the Profession or Industry*** *(5 points)* ..... 5 percent
4. ***Other Expectations*** (Professional Development, 10 points) ..... 10 percent
   a. Creative and/or Scholarly Production (Academic Faculty)
   b. Compliance with standards established by external agencies (Technical/Vocational Faculty)

Teaching. Learning is the heart of the enterprise at ICC. The evaluation process looks at five components:

1. *Student Evaluation of Instruction*

An average score of 4.00 (on items 16-20) is a reasonable minimum value for the SEI. A reduction of 5 points from the total of 50 will occur for each .25 points below the minimum score of 4.00 on the average of items 16-20.

Example:	SEI score	Total points
	4.00 or above	50 pts
	3.80	45 pts
	3.75	45 pts
	3.65	40 pts
	3.50	40 pts
	3.45	35 pts

2. *Materials Preparation and Materials Relevancy: Examples of Expectations*

- Has current and relevant syllabi
- Revises and/or updates course material
- Uses evaluation methods that are related to and are appropriate for course content
- Informs students of the objectives of the course
- Uses supplemental resources in addition to textbook or other minimal course materials
- Revises or develops curriculum

3. *Recordkeeping and Instructional Management: Examples of Expectations*

- Keeps scheduled office hours
- Meets classes as scheduled for prescribed time and uses class time well
- Submits required reports and documents, i.e., book requests, attendance verification, and grades as directed.
- Attends required meetings

4. *Advising*

Itawamba Community College is a service organization chartered to help students

achieve their goals. An integral process is advising. The evaluation process looks at student perception of faculty advising. This score is taken from the Advisee Survey, Students Services Report and associate dean/division chair observation.

5. *Student Retention Yield*

Keeping students is critical both to the success of patrons in the service area and to the health of the college. The retention yield looks at the percentage of students kept (by section). It is calculated by taking enrollment on the last day of Drop/Add and dividing that into enrollment on the last scheduled day of classes. A baseline of retention will be determined for each section taught by averaging the retention for the three previous years. Faculty would be rewarded up to 10 points using the following formula:

a) Matching the retention average or higher ..... 10 points

b) Within 5 percentage points below retention average..... 5 points

c) Greater than 5 percentage points below retention average ..... 0 points

Case Sample

	Code	Dept	Time	1996	1997	1998	Average	1999
Example:	2829	CHE 1223	B period	47 %	55%	58 %	53 %	52%

The above faculty member is 1 percentage point below the 3-year average. The instructor will receive five points. If the above instructor has an average of 53 percent or greater for 1999, 10 points will be awarded. If the percentage of retention is less than 48 percent, the instructor will receive no points.

Service to the College (Two required). Narrative report on committee work, projects or other activity undertaken to further the mission of the college

Examples of Expectations

- Serves on college committees
- Serves as chair of college committees
- Develops or revises courses and/or instructional programs
- Plans, conducts or participates in workshops
- Plans and participates in orientation activities
- Participates in student recruitment
- Sponsors a student organization
- Sponsors or participates in special student activities
- Prepares proposal for external grants
- Serves as guest lecturer or presenter
- Plans and participates in special activities for the college (Honors Day, Homecoming, Graduation, etc.)
- Participates in departmental committee work
- Participates in faculty-sponsored workshops
- Participates in student competition activities
- Edits or authors official college documents
- Participates in articulation
- Engages in accreditation activities
- Presents at area, state, or national conferences

Service to the Profession or Industry (One required). This component is best measured through work done to further the discipline as reflected in the faculty member's profession or industry. Offices held,

committees assigned, consulting or other activities may be used.

Service to Profession: Examples of Expectations

- Serves on appropriate local, state or national committees
- Serves as a consultant to organizations or corporations
- Serves as a consultant to other schools, colleges or universities
- Participates in professional organizations
- Applies academic expertise to any local, state or national community
- Represents the profession at state or national legislative endeavors
- Participates in professional/community organizations
- Holds national, state and/or local offices
- Contributes in chartering professional organizations
- Develops/revises curricula (CATS, PBL, etc.)
- Mentors colleagues and/or students
- Maintains competency in teaching discipline

Other Expectations (One Required)

Scholarly or Creative Production (Academic Faculty). As practitioners in higher education, faculty realize that they are more than "imparters of knowledge." This category is given the broadest possible definition and includes books, monographs, papers, performance, creation, multi-media (non-teaching related), grants and the like. Substantial production (e.g. a book, refereed journal article, externally funded grant, juried art show) constitutes *prima facie* completion of the component.

Professional Growth Within Discipline: Examples of Expectations

- Publishes books, journal or magazine articles, or monographs
- Presents recitals and exhibitions
- Stages, directs, or acts in musical, theatrical or dance productions
- Exhibits paintings, sculptures, or other creative arts (juried)
- Develops software/media
- Presents papers at conferences (by invitation)
- Participates in basic scientific investigations, both theoretical and applied
- Investigates and reports on educationally relevant problems
- Wins professional recognition - awards or honors
- Achieves advanced degrees
- Achieves advanced certification in technical areas
- Reviews relevant books or journal articles
- Receives award of externally-funded programs
- Reviews textbook(s)
- Publishes scholarly or creative work
- Has juried work accepted
- Edits national, state, and local publications
- Completes college courses for degree or advancement of knowledge
- Publishes books or laboratory manuals for college
- Attends area, state or national workshops or conferences related to expertise
- Presents at area, state or national conferences

Compliance with External Agency Standards (Technical/Occupational Faculty). As practitioners in higher education, faculty are expected to comply with local, state and/or national standards that ensure that instruction is being delivered at a professional level. This category includes compliance with these standards and also includes similar measures such as state and/or national program accreditations and instructor certifications.

Compliance with External Agency Standard: Examples of Expectations

- SBCJC Standards of Performance Compliance
- SDE/OVTE Measures and Standards of Performance Compliance
- ASE Program/Instructor Certification
- AWS Program/Instructor Certification
- Novell Network Administrator Certification
- SDE Program Accreditation
- NLN Accreditation
- A+ Certification
- CAAHEP Accreditation
- AHIMA Accreditation
- AutoCAD/AutoDESK Certification
- SME Certification
- APTA Accreditation
- ASRT Accreditation

Timetable of Retention Activities

Fall Semester

September to October ..... Service to College

September to October ..... Service to Profession/Industry

Last Day to Add Class ..... Fix Enrollments

December ..... Run Retention Report

Spring Semester

Ongoing ..... Service Activities

January ..... Distribute Retention Report

March ..... Administer SEIs

March 30 ..... Run SEIs

March/April ..... Conferences With Division Heads

April 16 ..... Administrative Evaluation Forms Due (To Dean)

May 1 ..... Notify Faculty of Contract Status

April/May ..... Write PIPs (As Needed)

May ..... Issue Contracts

Summer ..... Write PIP as Needed

Itawamba Community College

Administrative Evaluation Form

Name _____ **Division** _____ **Academic Year** _____

		Institution	*Individual*	*Difference*	*Score*
I.	**Teaching** (75 percent)				
	a. Student Rating of Instruction (50)	_____	_____	_____	____
	b. Materials Preparation (5)				____
	c. Recordkeeping (5)				____
	d. Student Retention Yield (10)	_____	_____	_____	____
	e. Advising Yield (5)	_____	_____	_____	____

II. **Service to the College** (10 percent) ____

_____

_____

_____

_____

III. **Service or Contribution to Profession or Industry** (5 percent) ____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. **Other Expectations** - Creative/Scholarly Production/Academic, External Agency Compliance/Career and Technical (10 percent) ____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(80 points required) **Total** ____

Division Chair Review _____ Date _____

Dean's Recommendation

_____ _____ _____

Renewal Improvement Plan Non-Renewal

_____ _____

Dean of Instruction Date

Selected Journal References

Cashin, W.E. (1990). *Student ratings of teaching: Recommendations for use.* (IDEA Paper No. 22). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cashin, W.E. (1995). *Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited.* (IDEA Paper No. 32). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Hativa, Nira, & Raviv, Alona. (1993). Using a single score for summative evaluation by students. *Research in Higher Education,* 34, 625-646.

Reynolds, Anne (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 1-35.

Shapiro, Gary. (1990). Effect of instructor and class characteristics on students' class evaluations. *Research in Higher Education, 31* (2), 135-148.

Smith, Ronald, & Cranton, Patricia A. (1992). Students' perceptions of teaching skills and overall effectiveness across institutional settings. *Research in Higher Education, 33,* (6), 747-764.

Williams, Ezra. (1992). Student attitudes toward approaches to learning and assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 17* (1), 45-58.